

REMARKS

Claims 1, 5, 8, 13, 14, 15 and 16 have been amended. Reexamination and reconsideration are respectfully requested.

Applicants' counsel wishes to thank Examiner Tugbang for the courtesies extended during the telephone interview on March 7, 2005. The following records the substance of the interview.

In the Office Action, independent claims 1, 8 and 15 were rejected as being anticipated by CHANDLER et al. (US 5,151,034). Further, these claims, as well as independent claim 16, were also rejected as obvious over CHANDLER in view of HUBER et al. (US 3,179,912). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections as discussed during the interview.

In particular, Applicants pointed out that independent claim 16 specified an assembly including a printed circuit board, an electronic component, and a fixing holder. The fixing holder included a holder main body portion having a projection protruding forward. The projection is "inserted into and engaged with an engagement hole formed at the printed circuit board" to fix the holder.

As discussed during the interview, CHANDLER does not disclose or suggest any projections that engage with the printed circuit board. Indeed, CHANDLER's Figure 2 teaches away from any such engagement since the tabs 22 and 24 are provided to hold the connector 54 (not the PC board), which connector 54 extends away from and above a surface of the circuit board 40. Hence, Applicants submit claim 16 is patentable over CHANDLER et al., whether taken alone or in view of HUBER.

Regarding independent claims 8 and 15, Applicants have amended these claims to positively recite that in the assembly the projection protrudes forward and engages with the printed circuit board. As noted above with respect to independent claim 16, these claims are also therefore submitted to be patentable over CHANDLER.

Regarding independent claim 1, Applicants have amended this claim to clarify that the holder is “substantially closed and hollow” in a longitudinal direction and that the base portion extends “beyond the holder main body portion in the longitudinal direction from one longitudinal end of” the holder main body portion. As shown in Applicants’ preferred embodiment of Figure 1a, the base portion 2a extends beyond the main body 2b from one longitudinal end thereof. Applicants’ claim 1 further recites that one surface of the base portion is opened to form a side opening. In a preferred embodiment, the opening is shown by reference no. 24.

By contrast, as discussed during the interview, CHANDLER’s retainer 10 is not “substantially closed” in a longitudinal direction. Moreover, CHANDLER’s alleged “base portion 14, 16” does not extend beyond the holder main body portion in the longitudinal direction thereof. Accordingly, Applicants submit claim 1 is also patentable over CHANDLER.

Regarding the claim objections, Applicants have adopted the proposed suggestions.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants submit each of independent claims 1, 8, 15 and 16 are now in condition for allowance. Further, claims 2-7 and 9-14

depend therefrom and are also submitted to be in condition for allowance. An early notice to that effect is solicited.

If there are any questions regarding this amendment or the application in general, a telephone call to the undersigned would be appreciated since this should expedite the prosecution of the application for all concerned.

If necessary to effect a timely response, this paper should be considered as a petition for an Extension of Time sufficient to effect a timely response, and please charge any deficiency in fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 05-1323 (Docket #3064NG/48834).

Respectfully submitted,

March 22, 2005



Jeffrey D. Sanok
Registration No. 32,169
Gary R. Edwards
Registration No. 31,824

CROWELL & MORING LLP
Intellectual Property Group
P.O. Box 14300
Washington, DC 20044-4300
Telephone No.: (202) 624-2500
Facsimile No.: (202) 628-8844

JDS:pct
364273